

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOEL SIGALA,

Plaintiff,

v.

LELAND DUDEK,
Acting Commissioner of Social Security¹,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:23-cv-1651 JLT GSA

ORDER ADOPTING THE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S APPEAL, DENYING DEFENDANT'S REQUEST TO AFFIRM, AND REMANDING FOR FURTHER PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO SENTENCE FOUR OF 42 U.S.C. § 405(g)

ORDER DIRECTING ENTRY OF JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF PLAINTIFF JOEL SIGALA AND AGAINST DEFENDANT LELAND DUDEK, ACTING COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY

(Docs. 14, 18, 20)

Joel Sigala seeks judicial review of a final decision denying his application for a period of disability and disability insurance benefits under Title II of the Social Security Act. (Docs. 1, 14.) Plaintiff asserts the ALJ erred in identifying his residual functional capacity because the ALJ failed to explain discrepancies “between the opinion evidence regarding Plaintiff's mental [and physical] impairments he found persuasive and the RFC in accordance with the regulations.” (Doc. 14 at 2; *id.* at 3-8.)

The magistrate judge found the mental RFC was not inconsistent with the medical opinion

¹ Leland Dudek became the Acting Commissioner of Social Security in February 2025. Pursuant to Rule 25(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court substitutes Leland Dudek as the defendant in this action.

1 of Dr. Williamson, as Plaintiff argued. (Doc. 20 at 5.) However, the magistrate judge determined
2 the ALJ erred in evaluating the evidence related Plaintiff's ability to reach and formulating the
3 physical RFC. (*Id.* at 5-9.) The magistrate judge found “[r]emand is warranted for the ALJ to
4 reevaluate the evidence concerning Plaintiff's right side reaching ability and to articulate a
5 reasoned conclusion....” (*Id.* at 9-10.) Therefore, the magistrate judge recommended that the
6 Court grant Plaintiff's appeal, deny Defendant's cross-motion, remand for further administrative
7 proceedings, and enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff. (*Id.* at 10.)

8 The Court served the Findings and Recommendations on the parties and notified them that
9 any objections were due within 14 days. (Doc. 20 at 10.) The Court also advised the parties the
10 “failure to file objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of rights on appeal.”
11 (*Id.*, citing *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014).) Neither Plaintiff nor the
12 Commissioner filed objections, and the time to do so has passed.

13 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court performed a *de novo* review of this case.
14 Having carefully reviewed the matter, the Court concludes the Findings and Recommendations
15 are supported by the record and proper analysis. Thus, the Court **ORDERS**:

- 16 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on March 11, 2025 (Doc. 20) are
17 **ADOPTED** in full.
- 18 2. Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment or remand (Doc. 14) is **GRANTED**.
- 19 3. The Commissioner's request to affirm (Doc. 18) is **DENIED**.
- 20 4. The action is **REMANDED** for further proceedings pursuant to sentence four of
21 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).
- 22 5. The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff Joel Sigala
23 and against Defendant Leland Dudek, Acting Commissioner of Social Security.

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated: March 26, 2025


26 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

27

28